1

2

3

4

5

6

7 Brian Williams, et al.,

8

9 10

10

1213

14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Eriksen Raul Leiva,
Petitioner
v.

Respondents

Case No. 2:15-cv-01265-JAD-PAL

Order Denying Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis and Motion to Appoint Counsel and Directing Clerk of Court to Serve Petition on Respondents

[ECF 1, 2,]

Nevada state prisoner Eriksen Raul Leiva has submitted a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and requests court-appointed counsel.¹ Having reviewed Leiva's petition under the applicable standards, I instruct the Clerk of Court to serve Leiva's petition on respondents, and I give respondents 90 to file a response.

As to Leiva's request for counsel, there is no constitutional right to court-appointed counsel in federal habeas proceedings.² The decision to appoint counsel is generally discretionary,³ and the court must appoint counsel only if the case is so complex that the denial of counsel would amount to a denial of due process or the petitioner's education is so limited that he is incapable of fairly presenting his claims.⁴ Leiva's petition shows that he is capable of fairly presenting his claims, and he does not raise complex legal issues. I therefore deny Leiva's request for court-appointed counsel.

¹ Levia also filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF 1, but has since paid the filing fee, mooting his petition. *See* ECF 3.

² Pennsylvania v. Finley, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); Bonin v. Vasquez, 999 F.2d 425, 428 (9th Cir. 1993).

³ Chaney v. Lewis, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 481 U.S. 1023 (1987); Bashor v. Risley, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 838 (1984).

⁴ See Chaney, 801 F.2d at 1196; see also Hawkins v. Bennett, 423 F.2d 948 (8th Cir. 1970).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel [ECF 2] is **DENIED**; petitioner's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [ECF 1] is **DENIED** as moot; and:

- 1. The Clerk of Court is instructed to electronically serve the petition [ECF 3] on the respondents.
- 2. Respondents have 90 days from the date of service of the petition to file a response. Respondents are cautioned that any response must comply with the instructions below, which are issued in accordance with Habeas Rule 5.
- 3. Respondents must raise any procedural defenses together in a single, consolidated motion to dismiss. No procedural defenses should be included with the merits in an answer. Procedural defenses not included in a motion to dismiss may be deemed waived.
- 4. Respondents are instructed that, in any answer filed on the merits, they must cite to and address the applicable state-court record, if any, that pertains to that claim. All state-court records should be filed as exhibits with a separate index that identifies each by number.
- 5. Petitioner will then have 45 days from the date of service of the answer, motion to dismiss, or other response, to file a reply.
- 6. The parties must **send courtesy copies of all exhibits to the Reno Division of this court:** Clerk of Court Attn: Staff Attorney, 400 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV, 89501. Courtesy copies may be submitted in paper form or as PDF documents saved to a CD, as long as each PDF is clearly identified by exhibit number.

Dated this 10th day of February, 2016.

Jennifer A. Dorsey United States District Judge

-2-